arXiv:1411.7668v3 [math.GR] 25 Jun 2016

FULLY IRREDUCIBLE AUTOMORPHISMS OF THE FREE GROUP VIA DEHN TWISTING IN $\sharp_k(S^2 \times S^1)$

FUNDA GÜLTEPE

ABSTRACT. By using a notion of a geometric Dehn twist in $\sharp_k(S^2 \times S^1)$, we prove that when projections of two $\mathbb{Z}$-splittings to the free factor complex are far enough from each other in the free factor complex, Dehn twist automorphisms corresponding to the $\mathbb{Z}$ splittings generate a free group of rank 2. Moreover, every element from this free group is either conjugate to a power of one of the Dehn twists or it is a fully irreducible outer automorphism of the free group. We also prove that, when the projections of $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings are sufficiently far away from each other in the intersection graph, the group generated by the Dehn twists have automorphisms either that are conjugate to Dehn twists or are atoroidal fully irreducibles.

1. INTRODUCTION

Due to their dynamical properties, *fully irreducible* outer automorphisms are important to understand the dynamics and geometric structure of $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ and its subgroups.([LL03], [CP10], [BBC10]). Just like pseudo Anosov surface homeomorphisms, fully irreducibles are characterized to be the class of automorphisms no power of which fixes a conjugacy class of a proper free factor of F_k. Since their dynamical properties and their role in $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ is similar to those of pseudo Anosov mapping classes for the mapping class group, to construct fully irreducibles it is natural to seek ways similar to those of pseudo Anosov constructions. In this work, we will provide such construction using *Dehn twist automorphisms*, by composing powers of Dehn twists from the free group of rank 2 that they generate. This is inspired by the work of Thurston on pseudo Anosov mapping classes of mapping class group of a surface ([Thu88]) yet we use the similar ping pong methods Hamidi-Tehrani uses in his generalization of Thurston's to Dehn twists along multicurves ([HT02]).

Constructing fully irreducible automorphisms by composing certain (possibly powers of) other automorphisms and locating free groups is not new to the study of automorphisms of the free group. For instance, Clay and Pettet in [CP10] constructed fully irreducibles by composing elements of a free group of rank 2 which was generated by powers of two Dehn twist automorphisms. However, the powers of the Dehn twists used to generate the free group were not uniform but depended on the twists, one needed to take a different power for each pair of Dehn twists to obtain a free group.

In their work Clay and Pettet studied Dehn twists algebraically, as outer automorphisms of the free group and they used algebraic tools to study them. As a result their construction produced the nonuniform powers of twists. In this paper, our goal is constructing fully irreducible automorphisms by studying Dehn twist automorphisms differently. We first change the model for $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ from the 1–dimensional one to the 3–dimensional one, $M = \sharp_k(S^2 \times S^1)$. This way, we were able to understand Dehn twists geometrically, using essential imbedded tori in M. This approach resulted in a more geometric construction of fully irreducibles.

More specifically, we will prove the following theorem using *geometric Dehn twists*.

Theorem 1.1. *Let T_1 and T_2 be two $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings of the free group F_k with rank $k > 2$ and α_1 and α_2 be two corresponding free factors in the free factor complex FF_k of the free group F_k. Let D_1 be a Dehn twist fixing α_1 and D_2 a Dehn twist fixing α_2, corresponding to T_1 and T_2, respectively. Then there exists a constant $N = N(k)$ such that whenever $d_{FF_k}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \geq N$,*

(1) $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle \simeq F_2$.
(2) All elements of $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle$ which are not conjugate to the powers of D_1, D_2 in $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle$ are fully irreducible.

Now we would like to give the definitions necessary to understand the statement of the Theorem 1.1 and explain the ideas used in its proof.

Splittings and $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ Complexes:

A *Dehn twist automorphism* is an element of $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ defined by using $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings of F_k either as an amalgamated free product $F_k = A *_{\langle c \rangle} B$ or as an HNN extension of the free group $F_k = A*_{\langle c \rangle}$. More precisely, it is induced by the following automorphisms in each case:

$$A *_{\langle c \rangle} B : a \mapsto a \text{ for } a \in A \qquad A*_{\langle tct^{-1}=c' \rangle} : a \mapsto a \text{ for } a \in A$$
$$b \mapsto cbc^{-1} \text{ for } b \in B \qquad t \mapsto tc$$

Given a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting of F_k as $F_k = A_1 *_{\langle c_1 \rangle} B_1$ at least one of A_1, B_1 is a proper free factor. In HNN extension case $F_k = A_1*_{\langle c_1 \rangle}$ the stable letter is a proper free factor. By Bass–Serre theory, each $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting of F_k gives rise to a tree whose quotient with respect to the action of the free group is a single edge. The edge stabilizer is $\mathbb{Z}$ and vertex stabilizers in the amalgamated case are A_1 and B_1 while in the HNN case it is A_1. We will coarsely *project* each splitting onto the vertex which is a proper free factor. In the amalgamated case we consider the Dehn twist automorphism corresponding to the $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting which fixes this free factor and in the HNN case the Dehn twist automorphism will be the one fixing the vertex stabilizer. We study the action of this Dehn twist on the *free factor complex* FF_k of the free group F_k of rank k and we determine under which conditions the compositions of the Dehn twist automorphisms give fully irreducible automorphisms. The free factor complex is a simplicial complex whose vertices are conjugacy classes of proper free factors of F_k and the adjacency between two vertices corresponding to two free factors A and B is given whenever $A < B$ or $B < A$. This complex was first introduced by Hatcher and Vogtmann in [HV98] as a *curve complex* analog for $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ and in this work we will use its geometric properties due to its hyperbolicity, which is given in [BF14a] by Bestvina and Handel.

There are several geometrically distinct hyperbolic simplicial complices $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ acts on by simplicial automorphisms which are considered to be analogs to the curve complex for the mapping class group. Contrary to the case with the curve complex and the action of the mapping class group on it, it is not always possible to identify fully irreducible elements with respect to the way they act on a curve complex analog. For example, an element of $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ might act hyperbolically on a curve complex analog yet it may not be fully irreducible. In this work the free factor complex was used since loxodromic action of an automorphism on free factor complex completely characterizes being fully irreducible for a free group automorphism. Thus, to identify fully irreducibles in a group generated by two Dehn twists, it is enough to have a loxodromic action.

As *geometric* Dehn twist we mean the following. For each equivalence class of a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting, by Lemma 2.6, there is an associated homotopy class of a torus in M. More specifically, an amalgamated free product gives a separating torus in M whereas an HNN extension corresponds to a non-separating torus. Hence, each Dehn twist automorphism corresponds to a Dehn twist along

the torus given by the $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting. The Dehn twist along a torus will be called a geometric Dehn twist.

Dehn twists and their almost fixed sets: To prove the main theorem we use a *ping pong argument for elliptic type subgroup* since Dehn twists have fixed points in the free factor complex. To define such argument one needs to construct so called ping pong sets. Thus we need to know first that the points of the free factor complex which are not moved too far away by a power of a Dehn twist are manageable. More precisely, let $\phi \in \mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ and let

$$F_C(\phi) = \{x \in FF_k : \exists n \neq 0 \text{ such that } d(x, \phi^n(x)) \leq C\}$$

be its almost fixed set in FF_k. The following theorem is the main ingredient in the elliptic type ping pong argument.

Theorem 1.2. *Let T be a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting of the free group F_k with $k > 2$, and D_T denote a corresponding Dehn twist. Then, for all sufficiently large constants C, there exists a $C' = C'(C, k)$ such that the diameter of the almost fixed set*

$$F_C = \{x \in FF_k : \exists n \neq 0 \text{ such that } d(x, D_T^n(x)) \leq C\}$$

corresponding to $\langle D_T \rangle$ is bounded above by C'.

Relative twisting and distances along paths: Now, to prove that the almost fixed sets of Dehn twists have bounded diameter, one needs to understand distances between points in the free factor complex. However we cannot assume that there is a geodesic between two points in the free factor complex which is appropriate for our calculation purposes since we do not know what these geodesics are. But it is known that the *folding paths* in outer space give rise to geodesics in outer space and their projections to free factor complex are quasigeodesics. To prove the Theorem 1.2, we have proved that there is a folding path whose projection to the free factor complex is at a bounded distance from the given free factor. To achieve this one would need an analog of the *annulus projection* and to be able to calculate distances on an annulus complex. Then using a version of *Bounded Geodesic Image Theorem* of [MM00] one would conclude that whenever the number of twists is more than the universal constant given in this theorem, the quasi geodesic between a point and its twisted image has a vertex which does not intersect the core curve of the annulus. However, we do not have the main tool for the purpose, which is an analog for annulus projection, since the subfactor projection is not defined for free factors of rank one ([BF14b], [Tay14].)

To calculate distances without using a projection we refer to a theorem of Clay and Pettet in [CP12] in which they give a pairing $tw_a(G, G')$ named *relative twisting number* between two graphs $G, G' \in CV_k$ relative to some nontrivial $a \in F_k$, which is defined by means of the Guirardel core. Using this pairing, they obtain a condition on the graphs $G, G' \in CV_k$ that, when satisfied, enables them construct a connecting geodesic between them, traveling through thin part of CV_k.

Relative twisting along tori in $\sharp_k(S^2 \times S^1)$: We have used the interpretation of *the relative twisting number* pairing $tw_a(G, G')$ for two spheres relative to an element of the free group, which is in our case the generator of the core (longitude) curve of a torus. Then the relative twist is a number which calculates distances between two spheres which are intersecting the same torus along its core curve. Mimicking annulus projection, the relative twisting number might be interpreted as number of intersections between *projections* of some spheres in M onto a torus (yet we do not make a formal definition of such a projection). With relative twisting number we were able to calculate a lower bound for the twisting number between a sphere and its Dehn twisted image, relative to a torus hence in some sense relative to a rank-1 free factor (related to its core curve).

Afterwards, a lemma of [CP12] by Clay and Pettet guarantees the existence of a geodesic between the corresponding points in the outer space along which core curve gets short. Using a Bestvina-Feighn lemma ([BF14a]) we project this geodesic to the free factor complex and using the distance calculations we show easily that the almost fixed set of a Dehn twist automorphism has a bounded diameter. This completes the preparation for ping pong with elliptic type group as it is given by Kapovich and Weidmann in [KW04]. Now we have ping pong sets that we have control over.

The main argument which also finishes the proof of our main result is encoded in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be a group acting on a δ-hyperbolic metric space X by isometries and $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in G$. Suppose $C > 100\delta$ and the almost fixed sets $\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_1)$ and $\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_2)$ of $\langle \phi_1 \rangle$ and $\langle \phi_2 \rangle$ respectively have diameters bounded above by a constant C'. Then there exists a constant C_1 such that, whenever $d_X(\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_1), \mathcal{X}_C(\phi_2)) \geq C_1$,*

(1) $\langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle \simeq F_2$ and,
(2) every element of $\langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle$ which is not conjugate to the powers of ϕ_1, ϕ_2 in $\langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle$ acts loxodromically in X.

Finally, we *project* Dehn twists to *intersection graph* $\mathcal{P}_k$. Its vertex set consists of marked roses up to equivalence and there are two types of edges between vertices. The first is that whenever two roses share an edge with the same label, corresponding vertices are connected by an edge in $\mathcal{P}_k$. Second one is obtained whenever there is a marked surface with one boundary component such that the element of the fundamental group represented by the boundary crosses each edge of both roses twice. This simplicial complex is closely related to the *intersection graph* introduced by Kapovich and Lustig ([KL09]) and it is hyperbolic. ([Man14]).

A fully irreducible automorphism is called *geometric* if it is induced by a pseudo-Anosov homeomorphism of a surface with one boundary component. A fully irreducible automorphism is *atoroidal* if no positive power of it preserves the conjugacy class of a nontrivial element of F_k. Moreover, only non-geometric fully irreducible automorphisms are atoroidal by a theorem of Bestvina-Handel ([BH92]). The important feature of the intersection graph for us is that the atoroidal fully irreducibles act loxodromically on this graph ([Man14]).

We obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 1.4. *Let T_1 and T_2 be two $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings of F_k with $k > 2$ with corresponding free factors α_1 and α_2 and let D_1 and D_2 be two Dehn twists corresponding to T_1 and T_2, respectively. Then there exists a constant $N_2 = N_2(k)$ such that whenever $d_{\mathcal{P}_k}(\sigma(\alpha_1), \sigma(\alpha_2)) \geq N_2$, $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle \simeq F_2$ and all elements from this group which are not conjugate to the powers of D_1, D_2 in $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle$ are atoroidal fully irreducible.*

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Ilya Kapovich for asking the question which led to the writing of this paper. I am especially indebted to Chris Leininger for his constant support and for suggesting a shorter proof for the main theorem. I am very grateful for Matt Clay for giving me permission to use his proof in this paper. Many thanks also to Mark C. Bell for reading the preprint and making many useful suggestions. Lastly I would like to specifically thank the anonymous referee whose suggestions and corrections improved the paper substantially.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Sphere systems and normal tori.** Let $M = \sharp_k(S^2 \times S^1)$. Then $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ is isomorphic to the mapping class group $MCG(M)$ of M up to twists about 2-spheres in M ([Lau74]). M can be



FIGURE 1. Imbeddings with the given identifications correspond to a separating (on the left) and a non-separating (on the right) tori in $\sharp_4(S^2 \times S^1)$.

described as follows: we remove the interiors of $2k$ disjoint 3-balls from S^3 and identify the resulting 2-sphere boundary components in pairs by orientation-reversing diffeomorphisms, creating k many $S^2 \times S^1$ summands.

Associated to M is a rich algebraic structure coming from the essential 2-spheres that M contains. A *sphere system* is a collection of isotopy classes of disjoint and non-trivial 2-spheres in M no two of which are isotopic.

We call a collection Σ of disjointly imbedded essential, non-isotopic 2-spheres in M *a maximal sphere system* if every complementary component of Σ in M is a 3-punctured 3-sphere.

A fixed maximal sphere system Σ in M gives a description of the universal cover $\widetilde{M}$ of M as follows. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the set of 3-punctured 3-spheres in M given by a maximal sphere system Σ and regard M as obtained from copies of P in $\mathbb{P}$ by identifying pairs of boundary spheres. Note that a pair might both be contained in a single P, in which case the image of P in M is a once-punctured $S^2 \times S^1$. To construct $\widetilde{M}$, begin with a single copy of P and attach copies of the P in $\mathbb{P}$ inductively along boundary spheres, as determined by unique path lifting. Repeating this process gives a description of $\widetilde{M}$ as a treelike union of copies of the P. We remark that $\widetilde{M}$ is homeomorphic to the complement of a Cantor set in S^3.

To be able to define a concept of Dehn twist, we need to use the correspondence between the equivalence classes of $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings of F_k and homotopy classes of *essential* tori in M, which is given in Lemma 2.6.

For us, a torus in M is an imbedded torus in M so that the image of the fundamental group of torus is a cyclic group isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$ in $\pi_1(M)$. Moreover, we consider *essential* tori only, the tori which do not bound a solid torus in M. There are two types of essential tori in M, depending on the type of the splitting of the free group they correspond to. Namely, for an amalgamated free product we have a separating torus in M and a non-separating one for an HNN extension of the free group. Two examples could be seen in the Figure 1.

As an analog of a geodesic representative from a homotopy class of a curve, among the representatives of a torus in a homotopy class, it is necessary to identify one which intersects the spheres in a maximal sphere system of M minimally. To this end, the *normal form* for tori is defined. Following

Hatcher's normal form for sphere systems in [Hat95], a normal form for tori defined in [Gül13] so that the each intersection of the torus with each complementary 3-punctured 3-sphere is a disk, a cylinder or a pants piece. And according to [Gül13], if a torus τ is in *normal form* with respect to a maximal sphere system Σ, then the intersection number of τ with any S in Σ is minimal among the representatives of the homotopy class $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. Here, by *intersection number* we mean the number of components of intersection between the spheres of a maximal sphere system and the torus.

In this work, we will implicitly use the following existence theorem form [Gül13].

Theorem 2.1. [Gül13] *Every imbedded essential torus in M is homotopic to a normal torus and the homotopy process does not increase the intersection number with any sphere of a given maximal sphere system Σ.*

2.2. **Geometric models, complexes and projections.** Given the free group F_k on k letters, the associated space of the marked metric graphs CV_k which are homotopy equivalent to F_k with total volume is 1 introduced first by Culler and Vogtmann in [CV86]. A marked metric graph is an equivalence class of pair of a metric graph Γ and a marking, which is a homotopy equivalence with a rose. Outer space might be thought as an analogue to Teichmüller space for the mapping class group. For the details we refer the reader to [CV86] and [Vog02].

The *free factor complex* of a free group is defined first by Hatcher and Vogtmann in [HV98] as a simplicial complex whose vertices are conjugacy classes of proper free factors and adjacency is determined by inclusion. It is hyperbolic by [BF14a].

We will use the coarse projection $\pi : CV_k \to FF_k$ defined as follows: for each proper subgraph Γ_0 of a marked graph G that contains a circle, we take its image in FF_k as the conjugacy class of the smallest free factor containing Γ_0. Now by [BF14a], for two such proper subgraphs Γ_1 and Γ_2, $d_{FF_k}(\pi(\Gamma_1), \pi(\Gamma_2)) \leq 4$ hence we have a coarsely defined map.

Another hyperbolic $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$– graph we refer to is the *free bases graph* FB_k given by Kapovich-Rafi ([KR12]). For $k \geq 3$, this graph has vertices the free bases of F_k up to equivalence, (two bases are equivalent if their Cayley graphs are F_k-equivariantly isometric) and whenever two bases representing the vertices have a common element these vertices are connected by an edge. What is useful for us is that FB_k and the FF_k are quasi isometric ([KR12]).

The intersection graph $\mathcal{P}_k$ has vertex set consisting of marked roses up to equivalence. Two roses are connected by an edge if either they have a common edge with the same label, or there is a marked surface with one boundary component and the representative of this component crosses each edge of both roses twice. There is a Lipschitz map between FB_k and $\mathcal{P}_k$, constructed by thinking of each basis of F_k as its corresponding rose marking and observing that $\mathcal{P}_k$ shares the edges and vertices of FB_k and has some additional edges between roses.

2.3. **Tori in M and $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings of the free group.** In this section we will establish the correspondence between an equivalence class of a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting and a homotopy class of a torus in M. Consider an imbedded essential torus τ in M. There is a simplicial tree associated to this torus. To obtain this simplicial tree we take a neighborhood of each lift in the set of lifts $\widetilde{\tau}$ of τ and we take a vertex for each complementary component. Two complementary components are adjacent if they bound the neighborhood of the same lift. We will denote this tree by $T_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ and as correspondence between this tree and the torus τ we will understand the F_k–equivariant map $\widetilde{M} \to T_\tau$ which sends each complementary component of a neighborhood of a lift to a vertex and shrinks each such neighborhood to an edge. The tree constructed this way is referred to as the *Bass-Serre* tree corresponding to τ. Recall that by Bass–Serre theory, the action of F_k on T_τ gives a single–edged graph of groups decomposition of F_k, and hence a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting of the free group F_k.

The next lemma gives the existence of an equivalence class of a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting for each homotopy class of a torus in M and its proof is based on the notion of the *ends* of $\widetilde{M}$.

An end of a topological space is a point of the so called *Freudenthal compactification* of the space. More precisely,

Definition 2.2. Let X be a topological space. For a compact set K, let $C(K)$ denote the set of components of complement $X - K$. For L compact with $K \subset L$, we have a natural map $C(L) \to C(K)$. These compact sets define a *directed system* under inclusion. The set of ends $E(X)$ of X defined to be the inverse limit of the sets $C(K)$.

The space $\widetilde{M}$ is non-compact and it has infinitely many ends. We denote the set of ends of $\widetilde{M}$ by $E(\widetilde{M})$. It is homeomorphic to a Cantor set, in particular, it is compact. For a maximal sphere system Σ in M, the set $E(T_\Sigma)$ of ends of the Bass-Serre tree T_Σ of Σ is identified with the set $E(\widetilde{M})$. By analyzing this set we were able to prove the following.

Lemma 2.3. *Let T_{τ_1} and T_{τ_2} be two Bass-Serre trees corresponding to two tori τ_1 and τ_2, respectively. If τ_1 and τ_2 are homotopic, $T_{\tau_1} = T_{\tau_2}$ and hence τ_1 and τ_2 have equivalent $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings.*

Proof. Let τ be an embedded essential torus. We claim that each lift of τ is two sided. For if it is not 2 sided, then there is a non-trivial (non-homotopic to a point) loop which intersects a lift once and connects an end of $\widetilde{M}$ to itself. Now by the loop theorem, this loop bounds a disk in $\widetilde{M}$. Then, the projection of this disk to M bounds a disk in M, which means that the torus bounds a solid torus in M. This contradicts the fact that τ is essential.

Hence each lift divides $\widetilde{M}$ into two disjoint parts. A transverse orientation on the torus gives an orientation on the spheres on each such parts and hence there is a labeling on the valence-2 vertices corresponding to these spheres. It is clear that each lift $\mathsf{L} = \mathsf{S}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ of τ defines a decomposition of the set of ends of T_Σ into two sets L^+ and L^- where $\mathsf{L}^+ \cap \mathsf{L}^-$ consists of two endpoints, corresponding to the axis of the lift L. For each torus, let us consider all the endpoints corresponding to the axes of all lifts and eliminate them from the set of ends $E(\widetilde{M})$ of $\widetilde{M}$. Let us denote the remaining set $\tilde{E}(\widetilde{M})$.

Now, for each lift L, we have a partition $(\mathsf{L}^+, \mathsf{L}^-)$ of the set $\tilde{E}(\widetilde{M})$. Since the lifts are disjoint, any two lifts L_1 and L_2 satisfy either $\mathsf{L}_1^+ \subset \mathsf{L}_2^+$ or $\mathsf{L}_1^+ \subset \mathsf{L}_2^-$.

We construct a tree corresponding to the set of partitions as follows: Given a pair of set of partitions $(\mathsf{L}_1^+, \mathsf{L}_1^-)$ $(\mathsf{L}_2^+, \mathsf{L}_2^-)$ with $\mathsf{L}_1^+ \subset \mathsf{L}_2^+$ or $\mathsf{L}_1^+ \subset \mathsf{L}_2^-$, whenever there is no collection of ends $(\mathsf{Z}^+, \mathsf{Z}^-)$ satisfying $\mathsf{L}_1^+ \subset \mathsf{Z}^+ \subset \mathsf{L}_2^+$ or $\mathsf{L}_1^+ \subset \mathsf{Z}^- \subset \mathsf{L}_2^-$ we take an edge between them. For each maximal subset of $\tilde{E}(\widetilde{M})$ which is not separated by any lift, we take a vertex. Since the partitions of ends do not intersect, we have a tree.

Now, since for each lift we have a partition of the ends, there is an isomorphism between the tree given by the partitions and the Bass Serre tree T_τ corresponding to τ. More precisely, we define a map between two trees by taking the "edge-midpoint" vertices of T_τ to the set of partitions (i.e. the components of $\widetilde{\tau}$). and the components of $\widetilde{M} - \widetilde{\tau}$, i.e. vertices of the T_τ, are mapped to the collections of lifts (topologically, the frontier components of these components), having the property that if L_1 and L_2 are two of them, then (assuming that we select the notation so that $\mathsf{L}_1^+ \subset \mathsf{L}_2^+$ there is no L_3 in the collection for which $\mathsf{L}_1^+ \subset \mathsf{L}_3^+ \subset \mathsf{L}_2^+$ or $\mathsf{L}_1^+ \subset \mathsf{L}_3^- \subset \mathsf{L}_2^+$

Now we claim that for a homotopy of embedded tori in M, the initial and final tori determine the same partition of the ends in $\tilde{E}(\widetilde{M})$, and hence they have the same partition tree, and the same Bass Serre tree as a result.

To see this, let τ_1 be homotopic to τ_2. To show that we get the same partitions of the endpoints from the lifts of τ_1 and from the lifts of τ_2, we need to show that if two endpoints are separated by a component L of $\widetilde{\tau_1}$, and L is homotopic to $L' \in \widetilde{\tau_2}$ then they are separated by L' too.

Let p and q be two endpoints separated by L. Fix an arc between them that crosses $L = S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ in one point. During the homotopy, although no longer imbedded, L moves in $\widetilde{M}$, in particular, it does not touch any endpoint. So assuming that the homotopy is transverse to the arc, its inverse image in $S^1 \times \mathbb{R} \times I$ consists of circles and arcs properly imbedded in $S^1 \times \mathbb{R} \times I$. Note that if the homotopy could cross an endpoint of the arc, then an arc of the inverse image could fail to be properly imbedded in $S^1 \times \mathbb{R} \times I$. But this does not happen since the homotopy between the two tori induces a homotopy between normal representatives of each tori, corresponding to a fixed maximal sphere system in M. By [Gül13] such a homotopy is *normal* at each stage hence cannot cross an endpoint.

Back to the inverse image of the homotopy between two tori, since only one endpoint of the inverse image of the arc is in L, there must be an odd number of endpoints in L' (i. e. the arc crosses L' an odd number of times) and therefore L' also separates p and q. □

Recall that given a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting of F_k, an associated *Dehn twist automorphism* of F_k is defined in two following ways.

$$A *_{\langle c \rangle} B : a \mapsto a \text{ for } a \in A \qquad A*_{\langle tct^{-1}=c' \rangle} : a \mapsto a \text{ for } a \in A$$
$$b \mapsto cbc^{-1} \text{ for } b \in B \qquad t \mapsto tc$$

On the left is the definition when the $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting is given by an amalgamated product $F_k = A *_{\langle c \rangle} B$ and on the right is the definition when the $\mathbb{Z}$ splitting is an HNN extension $A*_{\langle c \rangle}$ of the free group F_k. Note that the Dehn twist automorphism in the amalgamated case is defined up to conjugacy since it is possible to reverse the roles of A and B.

Before we give the last lemma in this section, we give two theorems relating $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings to free splittings which will be used in the proof.

Theorem 2.4 (Shenitzer [She55])**.** *Suppose that a free group $\mathbb{F}$ is an amalgamated free product $\mathbb{F} = A *_B C$ where B is cyclic. Then B is a free factor of A or a free factor of C.*

Theorem 2.5 (Swarup [Swa86])**.** *Suppose that a free group F is an HNN entension $\mathbb{F} = A*_B$ where $B \neq 1$ is cyclic. Then A has a free product structure $A = A_0 * A_1$ in such a way that one of the following symmetric alternatives hold.*

(1) $B \subset A_0$ and there exists $a \in A$ such that $t^{-1}Bt = a^{-1}A_1a$. Or,
(2) $t^{-1}Bt \subset A_0$ and there exists $a \in A$ such that $B = a^{-1}A_1a$.

where t is the stable letter.

Finally, the following lemma gives the converse relation between a torus and $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting hence explains why we are interested in tori in M. The argument is due to Matt Clay.

Lemma 2.6. *Given a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting Z and an associated Dehn twist automorphism, there is a torus τ in M unique up to homotopy such that $T_Z = T_\tau$ where T_Z and T_τ are the corresponding Bass-Serre trees.*

Proof. In this proof we will build a homotopy class of a torus from a sphere and a loop. First we use theorems 2.4 and 2.5 that relate a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting of F_k to a free splitting of F_k. Then to relate the free splitting to a homotopy class of a sphere we use a theorem originally due to Kneser ([Kne29]). This

theorem is later developed by Grushko [Gru40], and most recently by Stallings ([Sta65]) and these are the versions we will be referring to. We treat the amalgamated product and HNN-extension cases separately. Amalgamated case has schematic pictures Figure 2 and Figure 3 associated to the proof.

Case 1: We first consider the case of an amalgamated free product $F_k = A *_{\langle b \rangle} B$. By Shenitzer's Theorem 2.4, $\langle b \rangle$ is either a free factor of A or a free factor of B. Hence, there is a free splitting $F = A * B_0$ where $B = \langle b \rangle * B_0$ or $F_k = A_0 * B$ with $A = A_0 * \langle b \rangle$. Let us assume the former, and let $S \subset M$ be an imbedded (separating) sphere representing this splitting. We fix a basepoint $* \in M$ and assume it lies on S. As $b \in A$, there is an embedded loop $\gamma \subset M$ that represents $b \in F$ and only intersects S at $*$. For small ϵ, boundary of the closed ϵ–neighborhood of $S \cup \gamma$ consists of two components: an imbedded sphere isotopic to S and an imbedded essential torus τ_γ.

Every torus can be written as a sphere and a loop attached to it. Hence it is clear from the construction, that the splitting of F associated to τ_γ is the original splitting. However, there are some choices made in the construction of τ_γ and it must be shown that different choices result in homotopic tori. It is clear that changing S or γ in the construction by a homotopy results in a change of τ_γ by a homotopy.

Now since Shenitzer's theorem [She55] gives many possible splittings differed by automorphisms of B fixing $\langle b \rangle$ (Hence Nielsen automorphisms that fix b), we need to consider two different complementary free factors B_0 and B_1 of A such that $\langle b \rangle * B_0 = \langle b \rangle * B_1 = B$ and show that the tori obtained after we add the loop to corresponding spheres are homotopic, even when the spheres themselves are not. For this, let S_0 and S_1 be the spheres representing the splittings $A * B_0$ and $A * B_1$ respectively and τ_0 and τ_1 be the tori as constructed above using these spheres. We assume that γ intersects S_0 only at the fix basepoint $* \in M$.

We first treat the special case that B_1 is obtained from B_0 by replacing a generator $x \in B_0$ by xb. Fix a basis for F consisting of a basis for A and a basis for B_0 where x is one of the generators for B_0. This corresponds to a sphere system in M which decomposes as $\Sigma_A \cup \Sigma_{B_0}$; the sphere S_0 separates the two sets Σ_A and Σ_{B_0}. In terms of these sphere systems, we can describe a homeomorphism that takes S_0 to (a sphere isotopic to) S_1.

Denote by Σ_γ the ordered set of spheres (all in Σ_A) pierced by γ starting from the basepoint. Cut M open along the sphere β corresponding to the generator x and via a homotopy push the boundary sphere β^- through the spheres in Σ_γ in order, dragging S_0 along. After regluing β^+ and β^-, the image of S_0 is S_1 and the sphere β now corresponds to xb. By shrinking β^- and S_0, we can assume that homotopy is the identity on τ_0 and γ. Thus, we have a homeomorphism taking S_0 to S_1, $S_0 \cup \gamma$ to $S_1 \cup \gamma$ and is the identity on τ_0. As a homeomorphism takes a regular neighborhood to a regular neighborhood, τ_0 is homotopic to τ_1.

To see a schematic picture of this homotopy we refer the reader to the Figure 2. In the first picture, the black sphere (an example of S_0) and a neighborhood of the red loop gives a torus (τ_0). And this torus is homotopic to the torus obtained from the last picture by taking a neighborhood of the black sphere (now an example for S_1) and the red loop.

A similar argument works if we replace x by xb^{-1}, bx or $b^{-1}x$.

The general case now follows as we can transform B_0 to B_1 by a finite sequence of the above transformations plus changes of basis that do not affect the associated spheres. Indeed, the subgroup of automorphisms of B that fix $b \in B$ is generated by the Nielsen automorphisms that fix b([Wad14], Theorem 4.1).

Finally, we need to consider the possibility that $F = A_0 * \langle b \rangle * B_0$ where $A = \langle A_0, b \rangle$ and $B = \langle B_0, b \rangle$. Let S_A and S_B be the spheres representing the splittings $A * B_0$ and $A_0 * B$ respectively,



FIGURE 2. The homotopy which slides the pink sphere along the red loop γ representing b where $\pi_1(M) = \langle a, b, c\rangle$. In the first picture, a sphere (black) and the b loop(red) is given where the base point is on the sphere. c is depicted blue in the picture.



FIGURE 3. In this example $F_3 = \langle a\rangle * \langle b\rangle * \langle c\rangle$ and $A = \langle A_0, b\rangle$ with $A_0 = \langle a\rangle$ and $B = \langle b, B_0\rangle$ with $B_0 = \langle c\rangle$. In the picture spheres S_A and S_B are seen in black.

fix loops γ_A and γ_B representing b and consider the neighborhoods s_A of $S_A \cup \gamma_A$ and s_B of $S_B \cup \gamma_B$. Since each of these neighborhoods give a torus and a sphere, we have tori τ_A and τ_B that both represent the splitting $A *_{\langle b\rangle} B$. In this case as a component of $M - (S_A \cup S_B)$ is $S^1 \times S^2$ with two balls removed, it is easy to see that τ_A and τ_B are homotopic. Indeed, let us model $S^1 \times S^2$ as the region between the spheres of radius 1 and 2 in $\mathbb{R}^3$ after identifying the boundary spheres. Remove a ball of radius $\frac{1}{4}$ at each of the points $(0, 0, 3/2)$ and $(0, 0, -3/2)$. For γ_A we can choose the intersection with the positive z–axis; for γ_B we can choose the intersection with the negative z–axis. Then clearly the torus obtained from the intersection with the xy–plane is homotopic to both τ_A and τ_B. For a simple example see Figure 3.

Case 2: We now consider the case of an HNN-extension $F_k = A*_{\langle b\rangle}$. By Swarup's Theorem [Swa86], there is a free factorization $A = A_0 * \langle t^{-1}bt\rangle$ for some $t \in F_k$, such that A_0 is a co-rank 1 free factor of F_k and such that $b \in A_0$. Let $S \subset M$ be an embedded (non-separating) sphere representing the

splitting $F_k = A_0 *_{\{1\}}$. We fix a basepoint $p \in M$ and assume it lies on S. As $b \in A_0$, there is an embedded loop $\gamma \subset M$ that represents $b \in F$ and only intersects S at p. Further, both ends of γ are on the same side of S and so a neighborhood of $s = S \cup \gamma$ gives a torus. Let τ be this neighborhood of s and as in Case 1, it is clear that the splitting associated to τ is the original splitting.

Given another torus $\tau' \subset M$ that represents the same splitting, we can compress τ' to a union of a sphere and a loop $s' = S' \cup \gamma'$ such that S' represents a splitting of the form $A_1 *_{\{1\}}$ where $A = A_1 * \langle tbt^{-1} \rangle$. Then as in Case 1, there is a sequence of transformations taking A_0 to A_1 that do not change the homotopy type of the corresponding torus. □

3. geometric intersection and relative twisting using ends of $\widetilde{M}$

3.1. **The intersection criterion and the relative twisting number.** The Guirardel core $\mathcal{C}$ is a way of assigning a closed, connected CAT(0) complex to a pair of splittings which counts the number of times the corresponding Bass-Serre trees intersect. Guirardel's version unifies several notions of intersection number in the literature including the one given for two splittings of finitely generated groups given by Scott and Swarup ([SS00]). For two F_k–trees T_0 and T_1 the core is roughly the main part of the diagonal action of the F_k on $T_0 \times T_1$. For the details we refer the reader to [Gui05] and [BBC10].

Definition 3.1. Let T be a tree and p a point in it. A *direction* is a connected component of $T - p$. Given two trees T_0 and T_1, a *quadrant* is a product $\delta \times \delta'$ of two directions $\delta \subset T_0$ and $\delta' \subset T_1$.

We fix a basepoint $* = (*_0, *_1)$ in $T_0 \times T_1$ and we say that a quadrant Q is *heavy* if there exists a sequence $\{g_n\}$ in F_k such that $g_n(*) \in Q$ for every n and $d_{T_i}(*_i, g_n(*_i)) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. A quadrant is *light* if it is not heavy.

Definition 3.2. Let T_0 and T_1 be to F_k–trees. The Guirardel core $\mathcal{C}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(T_0 \times T_1) = (T_0 \times T_1) - \cup_I Q$$

where I is over all of the light quadrants.

Let p be a point in T_0. Then, $\mathcal{C}_p = \{x \in T_1 \mid (p, x) \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is a subtree of T_1 called the *slice of the core* above the point p. The slice which is a subtree of T_0 is defined similarly.

Given two trees T_0 and T_1, we define the *Guirardel intersection number* between them by:

$$i(T_0, T_1) = vol(\mathcal{C}/F_k)$$

where the right hand side is given by the volume of the action of F_k on the Guirardel core $\mathcal{C}(T_0 \times T_1)$ for the product measure on $T_0 \times T_1$. Note that for simplicial trees T_0 and T_1 this volume is the number of the 2-cells in $\mathcal{C}/F_k$, which will be our case.

Given a maximal sphere system Σ in M and a homotopy class $\mathbf{S}$ of a sphere S, the intersection number between a sphere $\mathbf{S}$ and Σ is the number $i(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{\Sigma})$ of components of intersection of a normal representative of S with spheres of Σ when the intersections are transversal ([Hat95]). This is called the *geometric* intersection number.

We need to understand how geometric intersection numbers between two sphere systems and the Guirardel intersection numbers between corresponding trees are related. Each sphere in $\widetilde{M}$ corresponds to an edge in the associated Bass–Serre tree and a geometric intersection between two spheres will give a square in product of the Bass–Serre trees. If the intersection is essential, this square is in the Guirardel core. By the definition of Guirardel core, a square which is in the core is in a heavy quadrant. As a consequence there exists 4 unbounded disjoint regions in $\widetilde{M}$ corresponding

to such a square. On the other hand, each sphere $\widetilde{S}$ gives two disjoint sets $E^+(\widetilde{S})$ and $E^-(\widetilde{S})$ of ends of $\widetilde{M}$. Thus whenever two spheres $\widetilde{S}_1$ and $\widetilde{S}_2$ intersect essentially in $\widetilde{M}$ there are four disjoint sets of ends $E^+(\widetilde{S}_1) \cap E^+(\widetilde{S}_2)$, $E^+(\widetilde{S}_1) \cap E^-(\widetilde{S}_2)$, $E^-(\widetilde{S}_1) \cap E^+(\widetilde{S}_2)$, $E^-(\widetilde{S}_1) \cap E^-(\widetilde{S}_2)$ of $\widetilde{M}$ in the complement of the intersection circle.

Finally we have the following definition which we will use in the next section.

Definition 3.3. We will call the existence of four disjoint sets of ends of $\widetilde{M}$ in the complement of an intersection circle between two spheres the *intersection criterion* for that intersection circle.

According to the discussion above, an intersection circle between two spheres is essential if and only if we have intersection criterion satisfied for that intersection circle.

Now we will define the *relative twisting number* for two intersecting sphere systems Σ_1 and Σ_2.

Given an axis of an element in $\widetilde{M}$, there are two ends of $\widetilde{M}$ which are fixed by this axis.

Definition 3.4. A sphere $\widetilde{S}$ is said to intersect an axis $\boldsymbol{a}$ whenever the two ends of $\widetilde{M}$ determined by $\boldsymbol{a}$ are separated by the two disjoint sets $E^+(\widetilde{S})$, $E^-(\widetilde{S})$ of ends corresponding to $\widetilde{S}$.

Now we will define the relative twisting number between Σ_1 and Σ_2 relative to an element $a \in F_k$. This number is meaningful when both sphere systems intersect an axis ba of a in $\widetilde{M}$. The definition of geometric relative twisting of [CP12] is for two points in Outer space, which are simple sphere systems in our setting. For our purposes we will translate their definition to a one which is stated in terms of ends of $\widetilde{M}$.

We will start by the definition given in [CP12].

Definition 3.5. Let Σ_1 and Σ_2 be two simple sphere systems in M and T_{Σ_1} and T_{Σ_2} the corresponding Bass–Serre trees. Let $e_{\widetilde{S}_1}$ and $e_{\widetilde{S}_2}$ be two edges in T_{Σ_1} and T_{Σ_2} corresponding to spheres $S_1 \in \Sigma_1$ and $S_2 \in \Sigma_2$, respectively. Then, for an element $a \in F_k$, the relative twisting $tw_a(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$ of Σ_1 and Σ_2 relative to a is defined to be,

$$tw_a(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) := \max_{\substack{e_{\widetilde{S}_1} \subset T^a_{\Sigma_1} \\ e_{\widetilde{S}_2} \subset T^a_{\Sigma_2}}} \{\, k \mid a^k e_{\widetilde{S}_1} \times e_{\widetilde{S}_2} \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } e_{\widetilde{S}_1} \times e_{\widetilde{S}_2} \in \mathcal{C}\}$$

where $T^a_{\Sigma_1}$ and $T^a_{\Sigma_2}$ are the sets of edges of T_{Σ_1} and T_{Σ_2} respectively whose elements intersect a fixed axis $\boldsymbol{a}$ of a.

Using the fact that a geometric intersection between two spheres is a square in the Guirardel core and hence it gives a separation of ends of $\widetilde{M}$ into 4 nonempty disjoint sets, we tailor this definition to the one below to suit our needs.

Definition 3.6. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\widetilde{S}_i$ be two spheres and $E^{\mp}(\widetilde{S}_i)$ be the set of ends of $\widetilde{M}$ separated by these spheres. Assume that both spheres intersect an axis $\boldsymbol{a} \in F_k$. Then the relative twisting $tw_a(\widetilde{S}_1, \widetilde{S}_2)$ of $\widetilde{S}_1$ and $\widetilde{S}_2$ relative to a is defined to be

$$tw_a(\widetilde{S}_1, \widetilde{S}_2) := \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid E^{\mp}(\widetilde{S}_i) \cap E^{\mp}(a^k \widetilde{S}_j) \neq \emptyset \text{ whenever } E^{\mp}(\widetilde{S}_i) \cap E^{\mp}(\widetilde{S}_j) \neq \emptyset, \\ \{i, j\} \in \{1, 2\}\}$$

4. Dehn twist along a torus: The Geometric Picture

4.1. **Definition of a Dehn twist along a torus.** We will now give the definition of the Dehn twist homeomorphism about a torus in M, a description of the action of such a homeomorphism on spheres in M, and a description of the action on F_k.



FIGURE 4. The image of the intersection annulus under a Dehn twist along the thick black torus.

To define a Dehn twist along an imbedded torus τ, we will take a parametrized tubular neighborhood of the torus in M.

Definition 4.1. Let $\tau : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times [0,1] \to M$ be an imbedding such that $\tau(\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \{0\})$ bounds a disk in M. Denote the associated torus $\tau(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \{0\})$ with τ. The *geometric Dehn twist* D_τ along the torus τ is the homeomorphism of M that is the identity on the complement of the image of the map τ and for which a point $p = \tau(x, y, t)$ is sent to $\tau(x + t, y, t)$.

Here, the direction of the associated torus which bounds a disk in M will be the *meridional* direction and the other one will be called *longitude* direction. For a geometric description of the twist, we refer the reader to Figure 4.

Now, an ambiguity might arise in the definition of a geometric Dehn twist when it comes to determining a longitude curve for the parametrization. But two such choices differ by a map $x \mapsto x + ny$ for some integer n and a twist along the meridional direction. By work of Laudenbach ([Lau74]) meridional direction does not give a non-trivial homeomorphism since twists along meridional direction correspond to twists along 2–spheres in M. It is known that such mapping classes act trivially on F_k hence they are in the kernel of the homomorphism $MCG(M) \to \mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ ([HM90]). Hence, the induced outer automorphism $D_{\tau *}$ from the geometric Dehn twist D_τ is independent of the parametrization of the neighborhood of the torus (image of the map τ).

Now, assume that we have a loop ξ intersecting a torus τ transversely. Then the image $D_\tau(\xi)$ of the loop under the geometric twist D_τ is obtained as follows: we surger the loop at the intersection point and insert a loop β^+ or β^- representing a generator of $\pi_1(\tau)$ in $\pi_1(M)$, depending on which side of the torus the intersection point is. Hence the induced automorphism conjugates ξ with one of β^+ or β^- and fixes the other. If τ is non-separating, then the stable letter is multiplied by ξ.

This coincides with the action of $D_{\tau *}$ on the corresponding splitting: When the splitting is amalgamated product of the form $A *_{\langle c \rangle} B$, A is fixed whereas B is conjugated by the generator of the fundamental group of torus τ in M. (Roles of A, B might be changed.) When we have $A *_{\langle tct^{-1} = c' \rangle}$, $D_{\tau *}$ fixes A and t is multiplied by c.

As a summary we have,

Lemma 4.2. *Let τ be an imbedded torus and D_τ the associated geometric Dehn twist. Then, $D_{\tau*} = D_Z$ where $D_{\tau*}$ is the Dehn twist automorphism induced by the homeomorphism D_τ and D_Z is the Dehn twist automorphism given by the $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting Z associated to the torus τ.*

From the lemmata 4.2 and 2.3, we easily deduce the following.

Proposition 4.3. *Let τ_1 and τ_2 be two homotopic tori. Then up to conjugacy we have $D_{\tau_1*} = D_{\tau_2*}$ where D_{τ_1*} and D_{τ_2*} are the Dehn twist automorphisms induced by the geometric Dehn twists D_{τ_1} and D_{τ_2}.*

Proof. Since homotopic tori give equivalent splittings by Lemma 2.3, the Dehn twist automorphisms are equal by the definition. Then by lemma 4.2 the corresponding Dehn twists induced by the geometric Dehn twists are equal. □

For our purposes, we need to find a lower bound on $tw_a(G, D_T^n(G))$ for a given simple sphere system G and a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting T. Now we have $D_T = D_\tau$ where τ is the essential imbedded torus given by the $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting T for which the Dehn twist is defined and a is the generator of the image of the fundamental group of τ in $\pi_1(M)$ under the map induced from the imbedding $\iota : \tau \to M$. Now we take a maximal sphere system containing G and homotope τ to be normal with respect to this sphere system. Then τ intersects the spheres of Σ minimally, by [Gül13]. Now we take a lift of the torus which has an axis a conjugate of a. The relative twisting number counts the number of iterates of a sphere which intersect image of another sphere under a Dehn twist along an axis. Hence we have,

$$tw_a(G, D_T^n(G)) = tw_\tau(G, D_\tau^n(G)).$$

5. Lower Bound on the Relative Twisting Number

In this section we will prove that the relative twisting number of a simple sphere system and its Dehn twisted image has a lower bound, which is linear with respect to the power of the Dehn twist. We first have the following introductory lemma, recall that for a sphere system in M, *simple* means that the complementary components in M are simply connected.

Given a sphere S and a torus τ an intersection circle of $S \cap \tau$ which does not bound a disk in τ is called a *meridian* in τ.

Lemma 5.1. *Given an imbedded essential torus τ and a simple sphere system G, there exists a sphere $\boldsymbol{S} \in G$ such that at least one intersection between $\boldsymbol{S}$ and τ is meridian in τ.*

Proof. We first complete G to a maximal sphere system and homotope τ to be normal with respect to this maximal sphere system. Then τ intersects minimally every sphere of G it intersects ([Gül13]). Assume that no isotopy class of spheres in G intersect τ in a way that the intersection is meridian in τ. On the other hand, since τ is essential, the image of the fundamental group of τ in $\pi_1(M)$ is non-trivial. Hence, the core curve of τ exists and by the assumption it must be contained in a complementary component of G in M. But this is not possible since G is simple. □

Theorem 5.2. *Let T be a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting of the free group F_k, τ the associated torus and D_τ the Dehn twist along τ. For $G \in CV_k$ and $n \geq 2$,*

$$tw_\tau(G, D_\tau^n(G)) \geq n - 1.$$



FIGURE 5. Fundamental domains, sets of ends separated by $\widetilde{\tau}_0$ and an arc ℓ_0 connecting them.



FIGURE 6. The image of ℓ_0 under Dehn twisting and sets of ends corresponding to the intersection $\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\widetilde{S}_0) \cap \widetilde{S}_{0,1}$.

Proof. We will prove this theorem by taking G as a simple sphere system instead of a marked metric graph. Let Σ be a maximal sphere system completing G and homotope τ to be the normal with respect to Σ.

Now, let $S \in G$ be such that S and τ intersect in a way that $\mu = S \cap \tau$ is meridian in τ. The existence of a meridional intersection circle is given by Lemma 5.1. As before, let D_τ be the Dehn twist along the normal torus τ. More precisely, let $N(\tau)$ be a tubular neighborhood of τ in which D_τ is supported. Let $\widetilde{\tau}$ be the full preimage of τ in $\widetilde{M}$ and $\widetilde{\tau}_0$ a component, $N(\widetilde{\tau})$ be the full preimage of $N(\tau)$ and $N(\widetilde{\tau}_0)$ be the component containing $\widetilde{\tau}_0$. Let $\widetilde{S}$ be the full preimage of S, and $\widetilde{S_0}$ a component such that $\widetilde{S_0} \cap \widetilde{\tau}_0 = \widetilde{\mu}_0$, a lift of μ. Let us call a the generator of $\pi_1(\tau)$ corresponding to

$\widetilde{\tau}_0$, hence we have a covering transformation $a : \widetilde{M} \to \widetilde{M}$ which stabilizes $\widetilde{\tau}_0$. Let Δ be the region between $\widetilde{S}_0$ and $a\widetilde{S}_0$ which is the fundamental domain of $\langle a \rangle$ on $\widetilde{M}$. Set $\widetilde{S}_{0,j} = a^j \widetilde{S}_0$. Then $a^j\Delta$ is the region bounded by $\widetilde{S}_{0,j}$ and $\widetilde{S}_{0,j+1}$.

Since $tw_\tau(G, D^n_\tau(G)) \geq tw_\tau(S, D^n_\tau(S))$, it is sufficient to prove that

$$tw_\tau(S, D^n_\tau(S)) \geq n - 1.$$

Let us denote by $E(\widetilde{M})$ the ends of $\widetilde{M}$. As it was discussed in Section 2.2, there is a pair of ends of $\widetilde{M}$ fixed by a and $\widetilde{\tau}_0$ separates the remaining set of ends into two disjoint sets E^+_0 and E^-_0. Since $\widetilde{\tau}_0$ is separating in $\widetilde{M}$, there is a ray ℓ which connects an end $\mathsf{e}^+ \in E^+_0$ to an end $\mathsf{e}^- \in E^-_0$, intersecting $\widetilde{\tau}_0$ only once. Observe that since τ is essential, there is always such ray which is disjoint from $\widetilde{\tau} - \widetilde{\tau}_0$.

Let X^+ and X^- be the components of $\widetilde{M} - N(\widetilde{\tau})$ whose closures meet $N(\widetilde{\tau}_0)$. Since D_τ is identity on $M - N(\tau)$ we choose a lift $\widetilde{D}_\tau$ which is the identity on X^- and a translation on X^+. Without loss of generality we may assume this is translation by a. Hence, $\widetilde{D}_\tau(\mathsf{e}^-) = \mathsf{e}^-$ and $\widetilde{D}^m_\tau(\mathsf{e}^+) = \mathsf{a}^\mathsf{m}\mathsf{e}^+$.

Let $E^-_{0,0} \subset E^-_0$ and $E^+_{0,0} \subset E^+_0$ be two disjoint sets of ends in Δ. Now, as described above, in this fundamental domain there is a line ℓ_0 which connects an end e^-_0 in $E^-_{0,0}$ to an end e^+_0 in $E^+_{0,0}$ intersecting $\widetilde{\tau}$ once in $\widetilde{\tau}_0$. (See the Figure 5). Now, after n times Dehn twisting along $\widetilde{\tau}$, the image ray $\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\ell_0)$ will connect the point e^-_0 in $E^-_{0,0}$ to the point $\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\mathsf{e}^+_\mathsf{0}) = \mathsf{a}^\mathsf{n}\mathsf{e}^+_\mathsf{0} = \mathsf{e}^+_\mathsf{n}$ in $E^+_{0,n-1} = \widetilde{D}^n_\tau(E^+_{0,0})$. (See the schematic picture Figure 6).

On the other hand, let us denote by $E^+(\widetilde{S}_{0,s})$ and $E^-(\widetilde{S}_{0,s})$ the two disjoint sets of ends corresponding to the sphere $\widetilde{S}_{0,s}$, for $s \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$. Now, without loss of generality assume that $\mathsf{e}^-_\mathsf{0} \in E^-(\widetilde{S}_{0,1})$. Then, since the image ray $\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\ell_0)$ still intersects $\widetilde{\tau}_0$ only once, and does not intersect neither $\widetilde{S}_0$ (this would create a bigon) nor any other lift of the torus, $\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\mathsf{e}^+_\mathsf{0}) = \mathsf{e}^+_\mathsf{n} \in E^+(\widetilde{S}_{0,1})$. So for $s = 1$ we have 4 disjoint, non empty sets of ends $E^+(\widetilde{S}_{0,1}) \cap E^-_{0,0}$, $E^+(\widetilde{S}_{0,1}) \cap E^+_{0,0}$, $E^-(\widetilde{S}_{0,1}) \cap E^-_{0,0}$ and $E^-(\widetilde{S}_{0,1}) \cap E^+_{0,0}$. By intersection criterion, this shows that $\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\ell_0)$ intersects $\widetilde{S}_{0,1}$. Since $E^+(\widetilde{S}_{0,1}) \subset E^+(\widetilde{S}_{0,n})$ and $E^-(\widetilde{S}_{0,n}) \subset E^-(\widetilde{S}_{0,0})$ we similarly have the nonempty disjoint sets of ends $E^+(\widetilde{S}_{0,n}) \cap E^-_{0,n-1}$, $E^+(\widetilde{S}_{0,n}) \cap E^+_{0,n-1}$, $E^-(\widetilde{S}_{0,n}) \cap E^-_{0,n-1}$ and $E^-(\widetilde{S}_{0,n}) \cap E^+_{0,n-1}$. Again by intersection criterion this means that $\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\ell_0)$ intersects $\widetilde{S}_{0,n}$ as well. As a result, $\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\ell_0)$ intersects all iterates $\widetilde{S}_{0,s},\ s \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ of $\widetilde{S}_0$.

Hence $\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\widetilde{S}_0)$ intersects all $n - 1$ iterates of $\widetilde{S_0}$. More precisely,

$$\widetilde{D}^n_\tau(\widetilde{S}_0) \cap \widetilde{S}_{0,j} \neq \emptyset \text{ for } j = 1, \cdots, n,\ \ n \geq 2,$$

and thus we conclude that,

$$tw_\tau(S, D^n_\tau(S)) \geq n - 1.$$

□

6. The Almost Fixed Set

In this section we will prove the following theorem which says that there is an upper bound on the diameter of the almost fixed set of a Dehn twist and this upper bound depends only on the rank of the free group.

Theorem 1.2. *Let T be a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting of F_k with $k > 2$, and D_T denote the corresponding Dehn twist. Then, for all sufficiently large constants C, there exists a $C' = C'(C, k)$ such that the diameter of the almost fixed set*

$$F_C = \{x \in FF_k : \exists n \neq 0 \text{ such that } d(x, D_T^n(x)) \leq C\}$$

corresponding to $\langle D_T \rangle$ is bounded above by C'.

6.1. **Finding the folding line.** For G_1 and G_2 in CV_k, let $m(G_1, G_2)$ be the infimum of the set of maximal slopes of all *change of markings* (a map linear on edges) $f : G_1 \longrightarrow G_2$. Then we define a function $d_L : CV_k \times CV_k \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$d_L(G_1, G_2) = \log m(G_1, G_2).$$

Despite being non-symmetric, since this is its only failure to be distance, d_L is referred as the *Lipschitz metric* on CV_k.

For an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ the folding lines $\widetilde{g} : I \longrightarrow CV_k$ are the paths connecting any given two points in the interior of CV_k, obtained as follows:

For $G_1, G_2 \in CV_k$ let $f : G_1 \longrightarrow G_2$ be a change of marking map whose Lipschitz constant realizes the maximal slope. We find a path based at G_1 which is contained in an open simplex of unprojectivized outer space and parametrize it by arclength. Then we concatenate this path with another geodesic path outside the open simplex obtained by folding process. The resulting path $g : [0, d_L(G_1, G_2)] \longrightarrow CV_k$ is a geodesic by Francaviglia and Martino ([FM11]), which we will call *folding line.*

For a given F_k–tree Γ and an element $a \in F_k$, let $\ell_\Gamma(a)$ denote the minimal translation length of a in Γ. To prove the Theorem 1.2, we use the following result from [CP12]:

Theorem 6.1 ([CP12])**.** *Suppose $G, G' \in CV_k$ with $d = d_L(G, G')$ such that $tw_a(G, G') \geq n+2$ for some $a \in F_k$. Then there is a geodesic (folding line) $g : [0, d] \to CV_k$ such that $g(0) = G$, $g(d) = G'$ and for some $t \in [0, d]$, we have $\ell_{g(t)}(a) \leq \frac{1}{n}$. In other words, $g([0, d]) \cap CV_k^{1/n} \neq \emptyset$*

6.2. **Converting short length to distance.** Let π be the coarse projection $\pi : CV_k \to FF_k$.

Lemma 6.2 (Lemma 3.3 [BF14a])**.** *Let $a \in F_k$ be a simple class, G a point in CV_k so that the loop corresponding to a in G intersects some edge $\leq m$ times. Then,*

$$d_{FF_k}(\alpha, \pi(G)) \leq 6m + 13$$

where α is the smallest free factor containing the conjugacy class of a.

Using this lemma we prove the following:

Lemma 6.3. *Let α be a free factor containing the conjugacy class of an element $a \in F_k$, G a point in CV_k and $\ell_G(a) \leq m$. Then, there is a constant B and a number A depending only on the rank of the free group such that*

$$d_{FF_k}(\alpha, \pi(G)) \leq Am + B$$

Proof. Let e be the edge of G with the longest length. Hence, $\ell(e) \geq 1/(3k+3)$. Then, α crosses e less than $(3k+3)m$ times. Therefore, by Lemma 6.2, $d_{FF_k}(\alpha, \pi(G)) \leq 6(3k+3)m + 13$. Here, $A = 6(3k+3)$ clearly depends only on the rank of the free group. □

6.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.**

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Given $x \in F_C$, let us assume that $G \in CV_k$ is a point which is projected to x. We will write $\pi(G) = x$. Let τ be the essential imbedded torus in M corresponding to the given $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting T.

Let n be such that $d_{FF_k}(G, D_T^n(G)) \leq C$. Up to replacing C by a constant we can assume that $n \geq 4$. By Theorem 5.2, we have $tw_\tau(G, D_\tau^n(G)) \geq n-1$. Since $tw_\tau(G, D_\tau^n(G)) = tw_a(G, D_T^n(G))$ where $a \in F_k$ represents the core curve of the torus τ, we can use Clay-Pettet Theorem 6.1. Thus there is a folding path, $G_t : [0, d] \to CV_k$ such that $G_0 = G$, $G_d = D_\tau^n(G)$ and a gets short along the geodesic $\{G_t\}_t$; for some $t \in [0, d]$, $\ell_{G_t}(a) \leq 1/(n-3)$.

Now, by [BF14a] and [KR12], the projection $\pi(\{G_t\})$ of the folding path $\{G_t\}_t$ onto FF_k is a quasi-geodesic in FF_k between $\pi(D_\tau^n(G))$ and $\pi(G) = x$. Let α be the smallest free factor containing a.

Then, since $n \geq 4$ we use Lemma 6.3 to deduce that

$$d_{FF_k}(\alpha, \pi(G_t)) \leq \tfrac{A}{n-3} + 13$$

where A is as it is given in the same lemma. Since $\pi(\{G_t\})$ is uniformly Hausdorff-close to a geodesic and $d_{FF_k}(\pi(G), \pi(D_\tau^n(G))) \leq C$, by triangle inequality we have

$$d_{FF_k}(\pi(G), \alpha) \leq \tfrac{A}{n-3} + C + H + 13 \leq A + C + H + 13$$

where $H = H(k)$ is the distance between the geodesic and unparametrized quasi geodesic $\pi(\{G_t\})$. Hence we have

$$C' = 2(A + C + H + 13)$$

.

□

7. Constructing Fully Irreducibles

In this section we will prove the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let T_1 and T_2 be two $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings of the free group F_k with rank $k > 2$ and α_1 and α_2 be two corresponding free factors in the free factor complex FF_k of the free group F_k. Let D_1 be a Dehn twist fixing α_1 and D_2 a Dehn twist fixing α_2, corresponding to T_1 and T_2, respectively. Then there exists a constant $N = N(k)$ such that whenever $d_{FF_k}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \geq N$,*

1. *$\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle \simeq F_2$.*
2. *All elements of $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle$ which are not conjugate to the powers of D_1, D_2 in $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle$ are fully irreducible.*

We will start with some basic definitions and lemmata, which are standard for δ–hyperbolic spaces.

Let (X, d) be a metric space. For $x, y, z \in X$, the *Gromov product* $(y, z)_x$ is defined as

$$(y, z)_x := \frac{1}{2}(d(y, x) + d(z, x) - d(y, z)).$$

If (X, d) is a δ-hyperbolic space, the initial segments of length of $(y, z)_x$ of any two geodesics $[x, y]$ and $[x, z]$ stay close to each other. Namely, they are in 2δ-neighborhoods of each other. Hence, the Gromov product measures for how long two geodesics stay close together. This will be the characterization of the δ- hyperbolicity we will use in our work as definition of being δ– hyperbolic.

Also, in this case, the Gromov product $(y,z)_x$ approximates the distance between x and the geodesic $[y,z]$ within 2δ:

$$(y,z)_x \leq d(x,[y,z]) \leq (y,z)_x + 2\delta$$

Definition 7.1. A path $\sigma : I \to X$ is called a (λ,ϵ)–quasi geodesic if σ is parametrized by arc-length and for any $s_1,\ s_2 \in I$ we have

$$|s_1 - s_2| \leq \lambda d(\sigma(s_1),\sigma(s_2)) + \epsilon$$

If the restriction of σ to any subsegment $[a,b] \subset I$ of length at most L is a $(\lambda,\mathcal{L})$ quasigeodesic, then we call σ an ℓ–local $(\lambda,\mathcal{L})$–quasigeodesic.

Let X be a geodesic metric space and $Y \subset X$. We say that Y is c–quasiconvex if for all $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ the geodesic segment $[y_1,y_2]$ lies in the c– neighborhood of Y.

For any $x \in X$ we call $p_x \in Y$ an *ϵ-quasi projection* of x onto Y if

$$d(x,p_x) \leq d(x,Y) + \epsilon.$$

In hyperbolic spaces, quasi projections onto quasiconvex sets are *quasiunique*:

Lemma 7.2. *Let X be δ–hyperbolic metric space and $Y \subset X$ c–quasiconvex. Let $x \in X$, and p_x and $p_{x'}$ be two ϵ–quasi projections of x onto Y. Then,*

$$d(p_x,p_{x'}) \leq 2c + 4\delta + 2\epsilon.$$

For a δ hyperbolic geodesic G-space X, consider the almost fixed set $X_C(g)$ corresponding to a subgroup $\langle g\rangle$ for $g \in G$. Then, the *quasi convex hull* $\mathcal{X}_C(g)$ of $X_C(g)$ is defined to be the union of all geodesics connecting any two points of $X_C(g)$. From now on we will work with quasi convex hulls of almost fixed sets. The following is a standard for δ- hyperbolic spaces.

Lemma 7.3 ([KW04] Lemma 3.9)**.** *$\mathcal{X}_C(g)$ is g-invariant and 4δ-quasiconvex.*

The following lemma appears as Lemma 3.12 in [KW04]:

Lemma 7.4. *Let (X,d) be a δ–hyperbolic space and let $[x_p,x_q]$ be a geodesic segment in X. Let $p,q \in X$ be such that x_p is a projection of p on $[x_p,x_q]$ and that x_q is a projection of q on $[x_p,x_q]$. Then if $d(x_p,x_q) > 100\delta$, the path $[p,x_p] \cup [x_p,x_q] \cup [x_q,q]$ is a $(1,30\delta)$–quasigeodesic.*

In the proof of Theorem 1.3 we use the Lemma 7.4 which assumes that the projections onto almost fixed sets exist. However, given a geodesic metric space X and $Y \subset X$ when Y is not closed in X, the closest point projection onto Y may not exist. To fix this we will use quasi-projections which exist quasi-uniquely when there is quasi convexity, by Lemma 7.2.

Now we will state and prove the following theorem which essentially proves the Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be a group acting on a δ-hyperbolic metric space X by isometries and $\phi_1,\phi_2 \in G$. Suppose $C > 100\delta$ and the almost fixed sets $\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_1)$ and $\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_2)$ of $\langle\phi_1\rangle$ and $\langle\phi_2\rangle$ respectively have diameters bounded above by a constant C'. Then there exists a constant C_1 such that, whenever $d_X(\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_1),\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_2)) \geq C_1$,*

1. *$\langle\phi_1,\phi_2\rangle \simeq F_2$ and,*
2. *every element of $\langle\phi_1,\phi_2\rangle$ which is not conjugate to the powers of ϕ_1,ϕ_2 in $\langle\phi_1,\phi_2\rangle$ acts loxodromically in X.*



FIGURE 7. The ping pong sets and a quasigeodesic between iterated points.

Proof. Let $p_1 \in \mathcal{X}_C(\phi_1)$ and $p_2 \in \mathcal{X}_C(\phi_2)$ be two points such that $d_X(p_1, p_2) = d_X(\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_1), \mathcal{X}_C(\phi_2))$. To prove the theorem we will pick a random word ω and construct a ping pong argument involving the sets $\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_1)$ and $\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_2)$. The goal is to show that the iterates of $[p_1, p_2]$ under ω give a local quasigeodesic, hence a quasigeodesic. Without loss of generality, for $g \in \langle \phi_1 \rangle$, we will start with proving that the path $[p_2, p_1] \cup [p_1, gp_1] \cup g[p_1, p_2]$ is a quasigeodesic.

Let $\pi(p_2)$ and $\pi(gp_2)$ be quasi-projections of the points p_2 and gp_2 on the geodesic segment $[p_1, gp_1]$. Then, p_1 and $\pi(p_2)$ are both 4δ–quasi projections. This is true for $\pi(gp_2)$ and gp_1 also. Since the difference is negligible we will assume p_1 and gp_1 to be closest point projections.

Now we prove that $d(p_1, gp_1) \geq C$. To see this suppose that $d_X(p_1, gp_1) < C$. We take a point x on the geodesic segment $[p_1, p_2]$ such that $d(x, p_1) < \epsilon$ where $\epsilon = \dfrac{C - d(p_1, gp_1)}{2}$. Then,

$$d(x, gx) \leq 2\epsilon + d(p_1, gp_1) = C.$$

which is a contradiction since p_1 is the closest point of $\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_1)$ to $\mathcal{X}_C(\phi_2)$. Since the claim is proved we apply Lemma 7.4 to conclude that the path $[p_2, p_1] \cup [p_1, gp_1] \cup g[p_1, p_2]$ is a quasigeodesic.

Now let $p_1 \in \mathcal{X}_C(\phi_1)$, $p_2 \in \mathcal{X}_C(\phi_2)$ be two points as above and we take a geodesic between them. Such a geodesic, which is called a *bridge* is not unique, however it is *almost unique*, when two sets are sufficiently far apart ([Lemma 5.2, [KW04]]). Hence assume that,

$$d(p_1, p_2) \geq C.$$

Since $C > 100\delta$ this is sufficient to have a quasiunique bridge. Now we take a word $\omega = \phi_2^{m_l}\phi_1^{s_l} \cdots \phi_2^{m_1}\phi_1^{s_1}$ and consider the iterates of the quasiunique bridge $[p_1, p_2]$ under ω.

It is known that by the hyperbolicity of X, given $(\lambda, \mathcal{L})$, there exists $\ell > 0$ such that a ℓ–local $(\lambda, \mathcal{L})$–quasigeodesic is a $(\lambda', \mathcal{L}')$–quasigeodesic where $\lambda' = \lambda'(\lambda, \mathcal{L}, \ell)$, $L' = L'(\lambda, L, \ell)$. Since we have $(1, 30\delta)$–quasigeodesic pieces, we have such $\ell = \ell(30\delta)$. Hence we let

$$d(p_1, p_2) \geq C_1 := \max\{100\delta, \ell\}.$$

Thus the path $\gamma := [p_1, p_2] \cup [p_1, \phi_1^{s_1} p_1] \cup [\phi_1^{s_1} p_1, \phi_1^{s_1} p_2] \cup [\phi_1^{s_1} p_2, \phi_2^{m_1} \phi_1^{s_1} p_2] \cup \cdots \cup [\omega p_1, \omega p_2]$ is a ℓ–local $(1, 100\delta)$–quasigeodesic, which is a quasigeodesic.

In particular, for any word ω in $\langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle$ we have $d(\omega(x), x) \geq |\omega|$ where $|\omega|$ denotes the syllable length, up to conjugation. Now, it follows that $\langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle$ is free. Since the path which is obtained by iterating any segment between two almost fixed sets under ω is a quasigeodesic, ω is loxodromic. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Consider the action of $\mathrm{Out}(F_k)$ on the free factor complex FF_k, which is known to be hyperbolic. Then for a sufficiently large constant $C = C(k)$, there exists a $C' = C'(C)$ such that the diameter of the almost fixed set of a Dehn twist is bounded above by C', by Theorem 1.2. Let C_1 be the constant from the Theorem 1.3.

Now, assume that D_1 and D_2 are the Dehn twists so that $d_{FF_k}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \geq 2C' + C_1$ where α_1 and α_2 are the projections of the given $\mathbb{Z}$-splittings T_1 and T_2 to FF_k, respectively. Then, since from Theorem 1.2 we have $\mathrm{diam}\{F_C\} \leq A + C + H + 13 = C'$,

$$d(F_C(D_1), F_C(D_2)) \geq C_1.$$

Hence, Theorem 1.3 applies to $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle$ with $N = 2\,\mathrm{diam}\{F_C\} + C_1 = 2C' + C_1$. It is clear that $N = N(k)$. As a conclusion, since loxodromically acting elements in the free factor complex are fully irreducible, every element from the group $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle$ is either conjugate to powers of the twists or fully irreducible. □

8. Constructing atoroidal fully irreducibles

In this part we prove the following theorem which produces *atoroidal* fully irreducibles. Recall $FF_k^{(1)}$ is the 1-skeleton of the free factor complex (free factor graph) and that $\sigma : FF_k^{(1)} \to \mathcal{P}_k$ is a coarse surjective map and that both graphs have the same vertex sets.

Theorem 1.4. *Let T_1 and T_2 be two $\mathbb{Z}$–splittings of F_k with $k > 2$ with corresponding free factors α_1 and α_2 and let D_1 and D_2 be two Dehn twists corresponding to T_1 and T_2, respectively. Then there exists a constant $N_2 = N_2(k)$ such that whenever $d_{\mathcal{P}_k}(\sigma(\alpha_1), \sigma(\alpha_2)) \geq N_2$, $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle \simeq F_2$ and all elements from this group which are not conjugate to the powers of D_1, D_2 in $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle$ are atoroidal fully irreducible.*

Proof. To see that $\langle D_1, D_2 \rangle \simeq F_2$ we use the Theorem 1.3. To do that, we need to show that given a $\mathbb{Z}$–splitting T and a constant C there is another constant depending only on C which bounds from above the diameter of the almost fixed set $\mathcal{P}_C$ of a Dehn twist corresponding to T.

Let x be a point in $\mathcal{P}_C$ and $\sigma\pi(G) = x$ for some $G \in CV_k$. Then, as before, we use the Theorem 6.1 of Clay and Pettet to obtain a folding line $\{G_t\}_t$ between G and $D_\tau^n(G)$ along which a is short, where a is the generator of the fundamental group of the torus τ in M. Then, since distances in the intersection graph are shorter, the Bestvina Feighn lemma 6.2 is valid,

$$d_{\mathcal{P}_k}(\sigma\alpha, \sigma\pi(G)) \leq d_{FF_k}(\alpha, \pi(G)) \leq 6m + 13.$$

Hence, we can convert the short length to distance in the intersection graph. Thus there exists constants A and B such that

$$d_{\mathcal{P}_k}(\alpha, \pi(G_t)) \leq Am + B$$

where G_t is the point along which a is short. Then the rest of the proof follows the same since the image of the folding line in $\mathcal{P}_k$ is a quasigeodesic and it is Hausdorff close to a geodesic by [KR12]

and [Man14]. Hence diameter of $\mathcal{P}_C$ is uniformly bounded above by a constant, and Theorem 1.3 applies to $\langle D_1, D_2\rangle$ with $N_2 = 2\,\mathrm{diam}\{\mathcal{P}_C\} + C_1$.

Since in $\mathcal{P}_k$ loxodromically acting automorphisms are atoroidal fully irreducible ([Man14]), an element of $\langle D_1, D_2\rangle$ which is not conjugate to the powers of D_1, D_2 in $\langle D_1, D_2\rangle$ is an *atoroidal* fully irreducible.

□

References

[BBC10] Jason Behrstock, Mladen Bestvina, and Matt Clay. Growth of intersection numbers for free group automorphisms. *J. Topol.*, 3(2):280–310, 2010.

[BF14a] Mladen Bestvina and Mark Feighn. Hyperbolicity of the complex of free factors. *Adv. Math.*, 256:104–155, 2014.

[BF14b] Mladen Bestvina and Mark Feighn. Subfactor projections. *J. Topol.*, 7(3):771–804, 2014.

[BH92] Mladen Bestvina and Michael Handel. Train tracks and automorphisms of free groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 135(1):1–51, 1992.

[CP10] Matt Clay and Alexandra Pettet. Twisting out fully irreducible automorphisms. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 20(3):657–689, 2010.

[CP12] Matt Clay and Alexandra Pettet. Relative twisting in outer space. *J. Topol. Anal.*, 4(2):173–201, 2012.

[CV86] Marc Culler and Karen Vogtmann. Moduli of graphs and automorphisms of free groups. *Invent. Math.*, 84(1):91–119, 1986.

[FM11] Stefano Francaviglia and Armando Martino. Metric properties of outer space. *Publ. Mat.*, 55(2):433–473, 2011.

[Gru40] I.A. Grusko. On generators of s free product of groups. *Matem. Sbornik N. S.*, 8:169–182, 1940.

[Gui05] Vincent Guirardel. Cœur et nombre d'intersection pour les actions de groupes sur les arbres. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 38(6):847–888, 2005.

[Gül13] Funda Gültepe. Normal tori in $\sharp_n(S^2 \times S^1)$. *Topology Appl.*, 160(8):953–959, 2013.

[Hat95] Allen Hatcher. Homological stability for automorphism groups of free groups. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 70(1):39–62, 1995.

[HM90] Allen Hatcher and Darryl McCullough. Finite presentation of 3-manifold mapping class groups. In *Groups of self-equivalences and related topics (Montreal, PQ, 1988)*, volume 1425 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 48–57. Springer, Berlin, 1990.

[HT02] Hessam Hamidi-Tehrani. Groups generated by positive multi-twists and the fake lantern problem. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 2:1155–1178 (electronic), 2002.

[HV98] Allen Hatcher and Karen Vogtmann. The complex of free factors of a free group. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)*, 49(196):459–468, 1998.

[KL09] Ilya Kapovich and Martin Lustig. Geometric intersection number and analogues of the curve complex for free groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 13(3):1805–1833, 2009.

[Kne29] H. Kneser. Geschlossene flächen in dreidimensionalen mannigfaltigkeiten. *Jahresb. der Deut. Math.-Verein*, 38:248–260, 1929.

[KR12] Ilya Kapovich and Kasra Rafi. On hyperbolicity of free splitting complex and free factor complex. arXiv:1206.3626 [math.GR], 2012.

[KW04] Ilya Kapovich and Richard Weidmann. Freely indecomposable groups acting on hyperbolic spaces. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 14(2):115–171, 2004.

[Lau74] François Laudenbach. *Topologie de la dimension trois: homotopie et isotopie*. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1974. With an English summary and table of contents, Astérisque, No. 12.

[LL03] Gilbert Levitt and Martin Lustig. Irreducible automorphisms of F_n have north-south dynamics on compactified outer space. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 2(1):59–72, 2003.

[Man14] Brian Mann. Some hyperbolic $Out(F_N)$-graphs and nonunique ergodicity of very small F_N trees. Phd. Thesis, 2014.

[MM00] H. A. Masur and Y. N. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. II. Hierarchical structure. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(4):902–974, 2000.

[She55] Abe Shenitzer. Decomposition of a group with a single defining relation into a free product. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 6:273–279, 1955.

[SS00] Peter Scott and Gadde A. Swarup. Splittings of groups and intersection numbers. *Geom. Topol.*, 4:179–218 (electronic), 2000.
[Sta65] John R. Stallings. A topological proof of Grushko's theorem on free products. *Math. Z.*, 90:1–8, 1965.
[Swa86] G. A. Swarup. Decompositions of free groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 40(1):99–102, 1986.
[Tay14] Samuel J. Taylor. A note on subfactor projections. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 14(2):805–821, 2014.
[Thu88] William P. Thurston. On the geometry and dynamics of diffeomorphisms of surfaces. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 19(2):417–431, 1988.
[Vog02] Karen Vogtmann. Automorphisms of free groups and outer space. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Geometric and Combinatorial Group Theory, Part I (Haifa, 2000)*, volume 94, pages 1–31, 2002.
[Wad14] Richard D. Wade. Folding free-group automorphisms. *Q. J. Math.*, 65(1):291–304, 2014.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801
E-mail address: fgultepe@illinois.edu
URL: http://www.math.illinois.edu/~fgultepe/